

APR 19 2006

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOSEPH HILL TAYLOR,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 05-50460

D.C. No. CR-92-01176-GT

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Gordon Thompson, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 6, 2006**
Pasadena, California

Before: PREGERSON, LEAVY, Circuit Judges, and BEISTLINE,** District Judge.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as may be provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

*** The Honorable Ralph R. Beistline, United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, sitting by designation.

We conclude that the district court did *not* err in sentencing Taylor to consecutive terms of custody. *See United States v. Jackson*, 176 F.3d 1175, 1176-78 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam) (holding that the district court has discretion to impose *consecutive* sentences of imprisonment on revocation of *concurrent* sentences of supervised release). Moreover, the 42-month sentence imposed by the district court does not conflict with the 24-month ceiling for Class C felonies spelled out in 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3). Indeed, the district court may impose up to 24 months imprisonment *on each count*, and run the sentences consecutively.

We further conclude that, when reviewed in its entire context, i.e., that of both the February 5, 2005 and June 6, 2005 revocation hearings, the sentence imposed by the district court was reasonable under the circumstances. *See, e.g., United States v. Cervantes-Valenzuela*, 931 F.2d 27, 29 (9th Cir. 1991) (per curiam) (“Simply because the court in this case chose to mention one particularly important factor does not mean that it failed to consider the others or that the sentence was imposed in violation of law.”); *Jackson*, 176 F.3d at 1178-79 (upholding imposition of consecutive sentences where district court mentioned only one of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors).

AFFIRMED.